

10

LUC-305 / La Porta 50-8-56-4

Remarks

Entry of the above-noted amendments, reconsideration of the application, and allowance of all claims pending are respectfully requested. By this amendment, claims 1, 3-4, 8-10, 15, 34, and 36 are amended. These amendments to the claims constitute a bona fide attempt by applicants to advance prosecution of the application and obtain allowance of certain claims, and are in no way meant to acquiesce to the substance of the rejections. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification (e.g., page 16, line 13 to page 17, line 21), figures (e.g., FIGS. 4 and 5-19), and claims and thus, no new matter has been added. Claims 1, 3-4, 7-18, 34, 36-37, and 39-40 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 4, 7-16, 18, 34, 36, 37, 39, and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Lamb et al. (WO 00/79827 A1; "Lamb"). Claims 3 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lamb. This rejection is respectfully, but most strenuously, traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action's citations to the applied references, with or without modification or combination, assuming, *arguendo*, that the modification or combination of the Office Action's citations to the applied references is proper, do not teach or suggest 1) the provisioning gateway configured to distribute user data between the standalone HLR and the server within the multiple-protocol home location register and 2) the mediation device coupled to the provisioning gateway, the standalone HLR, and the server, as recited in applicants' independent claim 1.

For explanatory purposes, applicants discuss herein one or more differences between the claimed invention and the Office Action's citations to Lamb. This discussion, however, is in no

way meant to acquiesce in any characterization that one or more parts of the Office Action's citations to Lamb correspond to the claimed invention.

Lamb (Abstract) discloses the Universal Location Service Register (ULSR). Instead of associating each MSC with an HLR and an AuC that uses the same messaging protocol as the MSC, each MSC communicates with the ULSR for user information. Applicants respectfully submit that the ULSR is a replacement for standalone HLRs. In this implementation, a mediation device or provisioning gateway would be redundant. Accordingly, Lamb fails to disclose a provisioning gateway or mediation device coupled with the standalone HLR and server. Lamb fails to disclose the provisioning gateway configured to distribute user data between the standalone HLR and the server within the multiple-protocol home location register. Lamb also fails to disclose the mediation device coupled to the provisioning gateway, the standalone HLR, and the server.

Accordingly, the Office Action's citation to Lamb fails to satisfy at least one of the limitations recited in applicants' independent claim 1.

For all the reasons presented above with reference to claim 1, claims 1, 4, 8, and 34 are believed neither anticipated nor obvious over the art of record. The corresponding dependent claims are believed allowable for the same reasons as independent claims 1, 4, 8, and 34, as well as for their own additional characterizations.


Withdrawal of the §§ 102 and 103 rejections is therefore respectfully requested.

12

LUC-305 / La Porta 50-8-56-4

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Carmen B. Patti
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 26,784

Dated: August 27, 2008

Patti, Hewitt & Arezina, LLC
Customer Number 47382